

REMARKS

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-11. Claims 1 and 9-11 are amended herein, and new claim 12 is added. No new matter is presented. Thus, claims 1-12 are pending and under consideration. The rejections are traversed below.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112¶1:

At item 7 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 112¶1.

The present invention modifies information from a provider transmitted to a user based on user and environmental conditions. For example, the content of the information regarding telephone subscription provided to user A who lives in location 1 and information provided to user B who lives in location 2 is different based on user conditions (i.e., user A makes international calls and user B does not) and environmental conditions (i.e., charges determined by the phone company for the respective locations). These conditions are used as a calculation or formula to modify or customize information.

The above-discussed features of the present invention are found at least at page 10, lines 2-15, page 23, lines 7-24, FIGS. 6-10 and corresponding text of the present application.

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(b):

Claims 1-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,052,714 (Miike).

The Examiner asserts that the excerpt generating section (100) of Miike generates an excerpt of an article by calculating similarities between the articles and the user profile in the same way as the present invention where environmental conditions are described as a calculation or a formula. However, the excerpt generating section (100) in Miike provides articles having the same contents to all users regardless of the user profiles (see, col. 8, lines 19, FIG. 7 and corresponding text). For example, an article selected based on profiles of users A and B would essentially contain the same content of information because Miike simply provides the users with excerpts of the articles retrieved (i.e., without changing or modifying contents of the article with respect to the users).

In contrast to Miike, the present invention modifies or changes information provided to users based on conditions. For example, using the same example of the telephone subscription discussed above, user A is provided with subscription information only pertaining to location 1 and international calls while user B is provided with subscription information only pertaining to location 2 (see also, FIG. 15 and corresponding text).

Independent claim 1, by way of example, recites, "storing environmental conditions that are predetermined conditions for an event [and] described as a calculation or a formula" and "acquiring user conditions from the terminal... the user conditions being input by the user and relating to and being specific to the user." Independent claim 1 further recites, "structuring, in conformity with the environmental conditions, detailed information related to the event including customizing values of the information and changing contents of the information with respect to the user in accordance with the user conditions."

Independent claims 9-11 also recite, "changing contents" of the information or data with respect to the user in accordance with conditions including conditions "described as a calculation or a formula" and distributing the "customized information" to the user.

Miike does not teach or suggest, "changing contents" as recited in each of independent claims 1 and 9-11. Instead, the contents of articles for which excerpts are provided have the same content regardless of user profiles of respective users.

It is submitted that the independent claims are patentable over Miike.

For at least the above-mentioned reasons, claims depending from the independent claims are patentably distinguishable over Miike. The dependent claims are also independently patentable. For example, as recited in claim 5, "when a predetermined condition among the user conditions is not yet set, the structuring unit temporarily sets at least one set value that the predetermined condition may take and creates the detailed information using the set value." Miike does not teach or suggest these features of claim 5.

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

NEW CLAIM:

New claim 12 emphasizes that the present invention includes, "creating information having a first content reflecting said conditions set by the first user within the information" and "changing the first content of the information to a second content reflecting said conditions set by the second user within the second content."

Miike does not teach or suggest, "creating information having a first content reflecting said conditions set by the first user within the information" and "changing the first content of the information to a second content reflecting said conditions set by the second user within the second content."

It is respectfully submitted that new claim 12 is patentably distinguishable over Miike.

CONCLUSION:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.


Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 03/03/06

By: 
Temnit Afework
Registration No. 58,202

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501